



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,718	09/23/2003	Ernest S. Baugher	37515-00000	2415

27171 7590 10/18/2006

MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY  
1 CHASE MANHATTAN PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10005-1413

EXAMINER

CHAVIS, JOHN Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2193

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/668,718

**Applicant(s)**

BAUGHER, ERNEST S.

**Examiner**

John Chavis

**Art Unit**

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 74 and 76 are directed toward non-statutory subject matter. Claim 74 is directed toward a transmission medium and claim 76 is merely software that does not appear to embodied on a computer readable medium and therefore, the claims are considered non-statutory.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-17, 22-27, 30-32, 37-44, 47-49, 53-55, 58-59, 63-66, 69-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauman et al. (5,412,756).

**What is claimed is:**

1. A method for generating validation logic executable in a target application in a target platform, comprising:

creating a metarule; and

creating target domain metarule validation logic based on the metarule and a target language of

**Bauman et al.**

See the title and abstract.

See Figs. 9,10, 12, 22 and 46.

“ “ “ “

the target platform.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the metarule is one of required validation, length validation, data type validation, range validation, enumeration validation, regular expression validation, cross-attribute, aggregation, and conditional.

See col. 13 line 41-col. 14 line 68.  
Also, see col. 45 line 58-col. 46 line 62.  
and col. 39 line 45-col. 40 line 49.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the metarule includes data.

" " " "

4. The method of claim 1, wherein the metarule includes logic.

" " " "

5. The method of claim 1, wherein the metarule includes an error message.

" " " "

6. The method of claim 1, wherein the target platform is one of ASCII files, C, C#, C++, COBOL, Java, Javascript, RDBMS, Visual Basic, and XML.

See col. 6 line 65-col. 7 line 12, col. 9  
lines 22-26 and col. 12 lines 64-67.

7. The method of claim 1, wherein the metarule is imported from an external system.

See col. 43 line 58-col. 44 line 68  
and col. 28 line 8-col.29 line 2.

8. The method of claim 1, wherein the metarule is exported to an external system.

" " " "

9. The method of claim 1, further comprising: submitting test data, including a data value, to the target domain metarule validation logic; and producing an actual validation result based on the submitted test data.

See col. 36 lines 23-45.

10. The method of claim 9,

" " " "

further comprising: submitting an expected result; and comparing the actual validation result with the expected result.

11. The method of claim 1, further comprising: outputting the metarule in a text-readable format.

See the figs. Specified above.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein the target domain metarule validation logic is generated for the metarule and contains logic to carry out the metarule.

See the rejection of claim 1.

13. The method of claim 1, wherein the target domain metarule validation logic is represented as a metarule validation function that receives a data value as input and outputs a violation detected.

See the rejection of claim 9.

14. The method of claim 1, further comprising: integrating the target domain metarule validation logic with the target application.

See again the rejection of claim 1.

In reference to claims 15-16, 30-31, see the rejection of claim 1 and fig. 5.

Claims 17 and 32 are rejected as claim 6.

See the rejection of claims 9-10 in reference to claims 22-23, 53-55.

In reference to claims 24, see the rejection of claim 11.

Claims 25 and 27 are rejected as claim 14.

See the rejection of claim 13 in view of claim 26.

In reference to claims 37-42, see the rejection of claims 9-14.

Claims 25, 27, 43-44 are rejected as claim 14.

See the rejection of claims 11-12 in view of claims 47-48, 58 and 69-76.

In reference to claims 49, 59, see the rejection of claim 16.

Claims 63-66 are rejected as claims 9-12.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 18-21, 28-29, 33-36, 45-46, 50-52, 56-57, 60-62, 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauman in view of the applicant's choice of design of how or who inputs data and where it is exported or imported to or from. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the various selections available to Bauman's system to enable alternative methods of input and to provide options to where data is provided from to enable design flexibility.

***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Chavis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3720. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00am-5:30pm, EST.

Art Unit: 2193

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Chavis', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

John Chavis  
Primary Examiner AU-2193